

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 16, 2007. Claims 1 to 5, 8 to 15, 18 to 25, 28 to 35, and 38 to 45 are pending in the application, of which Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 44, and 45 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

All pending claims (Claims 1 to 5, 8 to 15, 18 to 25, 28 to 35, and 38 to 45) were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. On Page 3 of the Detailed Action, the Examiner states that, while all independent claims end with the limitation claiming that the front and back surfaces have a mirror symmetry, the specification and drawings (Fig. 19) show that the front and back of a sheet do not have mirror symmetry. The Examiner suggests claiming instead that relevant information is matched in the front and back portions, which is the interpretation the Examiner takes. The amendments to Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 44, and 45 are seen to attend to this rejection. Applicant submits that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal.

Claims 1 to 5, 8, 9, 11 to 15, 18, 19, 21 to 25, 28, 29, 31 to 35, 39, and 41 to 45 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,995,719 (Bourdeaud'hui). Claims 10, 20, 30, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Bourdeaud'hui in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,495,561 (Holt). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus segmenting a sheet into a plurality of areas and arranging a print data in each of the plurality of areas. The apparatus includes print setting means for setting print settings; input means for inputting a plurality of sets of data arranged on the plurality of areas from an application, each set of data being print data corresponding to front and back surfaces of each area; determination means for determining whether a surface which undergoes an imposition process is to be at the front or back surface; page order setting means for setting the page-layout order on the surface of one sheet determined by the determination means such that, in a case where the sheet is cut into the plurality of areas, each set of data is arranged on the front and back surfaces of each cut area; and imposition process means for performing the imposition process, on the basis of the page-layout order set by the page order setting means, by separately collecting page data for the front and back surfaces of the sheet and respectively laying out the print data on the front and back surfaces of the sheet.

Claims 11, 21, and 31 are respectively directed to a method, a computer medium, and a computer program which are seen to generally correspond with Claim 1.

Amended independent Claim 41 is directed to an information processing apparatus segmenting a surface of a sheet into a plurality of areas and arranging print data in each of the plurality of areas. The apparatus includes print setting means for setting a specified sheet, required to segment a surface of the sheet into a plurality of areas and required to assign pages to each of the segmented areas, as an output sheet; layout order setting means for setting a layout order of pages to be imposition-processed for each of the plurality of areas obtained from segmenting a surface of the sheet; input means for

inputting drawing data of a plurality of pages; imposition process means for performing imposition processes, based on the layout order of pages set by the layout order setting means, by separately collecting drawing data for front and back surfaces of one sheet and by respectively laying out the drawing data on the front and back surfaces of the one sheet; and data generation means for generating print data to be printed by a printing device, from the data which is imposition-processed by the imposition process means.

Claims 44 and 45 are respectively directed to a method and computer medium which are seen to generally correspond with Claim 41.

Thus, among its many features, the present invention provides for determining a print layout order for a sheet such that the sheet is segmented into a plurality of areas in which an inputted plurality of sets of data is arranged on the plurality of areas. Each set of data is print data corresponding to front and back surfaces of a segmented area. For example, “address<sub>1</sub> and body<sub>1</sub>”, “address<sub>2</sub> and body<sub>2</sub>”, ... , and “address<sub>n</sub> and body<sub>n</sub>” are inputted as a plurality of sets of data. The present invention therefore provides for arranging every set of data with “address<sub>i</sub>” on a front surface of an area and “body<sub>i</sub>” on a back surface of a segmented area of a sheet for  $1 \leq i \leq n$ .

Bourdeaud’hui fails to disclose inputting a plurality of sets of data as print data corresponding to front and back surfaces of a segmented area of a sheet. Instead, Bourdeaud’hui discloses a process for laying out print data of 32 pages so that the data can be printed on a single sheet. Additionally, Bourdeaud’hui lays out print data of respective 2 pages for upper and lower surfaces on a sheet, which is segmented into four areas, when a print of a proof sheet is needed. Thus, Bourdeaud’hui relates to an imposition process for

obtaining a bookbinding print and the layout of successive pages (e.g., 32 pages) is determined such that a page order is serialized when the print is folded.

For example, if a plurality of sets of data, “address<sub>1</sub> and body<sub>1</sub>”, “address<sub>2</sub> and body<sub>2</sub>”, “address<sub>3</sub> and body<sub>3</sub>”, and “address<sub>4</sub> and body<sub>4</sub>” are inputted in Bourdeaud’hui, “address<sub>1</sub>” is the first data (first page) and “body<sub>4</sub>” is the eighth data (last page) arranged on a sheet. (e.g., Fig. 4 and 5 of Bourdeaud’hui). As a result, “address<sub>1</sub>” is printed on the front surface and “body<sub>4</sub>” is also printed on the same front surface of a sheet. In contrast, the present invention, when inputted with the same plurality of sets of data, arranges “address<sub>1</sub>” on the front surface of a sheet and “body<sub>4</sub>” is arranged on the back surface of a sheet. Therefore, Bourdeaud’hui fails to disclose the features of the claimed invention.

Further, as understood by the Applicants, Bourdeaud’hui increases the workload of a user by arranging data for a front surface and data for a back surface on the same surface of a printed sheet. In contrast, a user of the present invention would obtain printed sheets in which the front surface and the back surface have already been printed on their corresponding surface.

Accordingly, Bourdeaud’hui is not seen to disclose or suggest determining a print layout order such that an inputted plurality of sets of data is arranged according to the corresponding front and back surface of a segmented area of a sheet. In light of the deficiencies of Bourdeaud’hui as discussed above, Applicants submit that amended independent Claims 1, 11, 21, 31, 41, 44 and 45 are allowable and respectfully requests same.

In addition, the applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the invention, and in particular, is not seen to

disclose or suggest at least the features of arranging a plurality of sets of data as print data corresponding to front and back surfaces of a segmented area of a sheet. In particular, Holt has been reviewed and is not seen to remedy the foregoing deficiencies of Bourdeaud'hui. Any permissible combination of Bourdeaud'hui and Holt would not have resulted in the features of the present invention.

The other pending claims in this application are each dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

### CONCLUSION

No claim fees are believed due; however, should it be determined that additional fees are required, the Director is hereby authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 50-3939.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/

Frank L. Cire  
Attorney for Applicants

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS\_WS 1466005v1